

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 956

CG 032 148

AUTHOR Cuccaro, Carlo; Casey, Jean M.
TITLE Practicum in Counseling: A New Training Model.
PUB DATE 2002-09-00
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counselor Training; *Graduate Study; *Instructional Effectiveness; Models; *Practicum Supervision; *Practicums

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effectiveness of a new counseling practicum training model, which was developed as part of a Professional Development School (PDS) program. Unlike the traditional counseling practicum, the college instructor and graduate students worked together in a school setting one day a week. All supervision was provided on-site and the students were given immediate feedback on their counseling strategies and skills. The study examined what differences, if any, existed in student and classroom teachers' perceptions of the PDS practicum versus the traditional practicum experience. Findings concluded that students in the PDS practicum were significantly more positive about their experience than those in the traditional settings. Results from teacher surveys did not reveal significant differences between practicum settings. (Author)

ED 472 956

Practicum in Counseling:

A New Training Model

Carlo Cuccaro, MS, CAS

School Psychologist

Lanigan Elementary School, Fulton, New York

Jean M. Casey, Ph.D.

Associate Professor

State University of New York at Oswego

September 2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Cuccaro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Abstract

This study examines the effectiveness of a new counseling practicum training model which was developed as part of a Professional Development School (PDS) program. Unlike the traditional counseling practicum, the college instructor and graduate students worked together in a school setting for one day a week. All supervision was provided on-site and the students were given immediate feedback on their counseling strategies and skills. The study examined what differences, if any, existed in student and classroom teachers' perceptions of the PDS practicum versus the traditional practicum experience. Findings concluded that students in the PDS practicum were significantly more positive about their experience than those in the traditional settings. Results from teacher surveys did not reveal significant differences between practicum settings.

Practicum in Counseling: A New Training Model

The counseling practicum is a required and integral course in every credentialed counselor training program (CACREP, 2001). The practicum is a supervised experience in which counseling theory is applied to practice and it provides graduate students experiences in counseling with diverse clients in one-to-one interactions. Typically, these interactions are recorded on audiotape, and afterwards, students receive feedback from their course supervisors and peers through individual and group class meetings. The practice of skills in school and clinical settings is considered a necessary condition to develop professional competencies (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Typically, counseling practicum students are assigned to a professional setting where they meet with clients on a one-to-one basis. The students are required to meet with at least 4-5 clients weekly, for 40 contact hours over the course of the semester. Also, students develop and maintain a client log, tentative counseling plan and case notes for each client (SUNY Oswego, 1999). In addition to direct client contacts at their respective sites, the graduate students must attend weekly classes and individual supervisory sessions with their course instructor on campus.

Early in 2000, a local state university and an area elementary school developed a cooperative relationship as part of the Professional Development Schools (PDS) program. The PDS programs are public schools where preservice teachers, counselors and school psychologists learn "by doing" and where university and school faculty members together investigate questions of teaching and learning (Holmes Group, 1990). In this case, the faculty of the college School of Education, the counselor education training program, and

the local elementary school collaborated to improve the education of future teachers, counselors and school psychologists.

Within the PDS program, a different model of counseling practicum training was developed. This model, unlike the traditional method of practicum, attempted to integrate the theories of counseling and consultation as studied at the college, their applications within schools, and college faculty supervision, all within the public school setting. The graduate students in the PDS model practicum did not divide their time between counseling sessions in their respective settings and the on-campus supervisory meetings and classes. Instead, all the students who participated in the PDS counseling practicum spent one day per week together at the PDS elementary school. In addition, a faculty member from the counselor education department spent the same day on site to conduct group and individual supervisory meetings. The purpose of the availability of direct on-site supervision was to facilitate the students' learning by providing immediate feedback to counseling sessions and to assist the students in learning to become fully integrated into the school environment.

Research Questions:

This study sought to answer three broad questions.

1. Were there measurable differences between the two practicum models in terms of the graduate students achievement of the counseling practicum course objectives?
2. Were there measurable benefits to the practicum students, above and beyond the course objectives, to the PDS model in comparison to the

traditional counseling practicum model? In other words, how to the students respond in their ratings of the following items:

- a. Overall quality of practicum experience
 - b. Perceived understanding of practicum students' roles and responsibilities by classroom teachers
 - c. Familiarity with school atmosphere
 - d. Amount of interaction with school staff (e.g. counselors, school psychologists, administration)
 - e. Amount of interaction with counseling clients in settings other than one-to-one sessions.
 - f. Amount of collaboration observed between practicum supervisors and school personnel.
 - g. Relevance of information from supervisory meetings to practicum students' specific needs.
3. Are there measurable differences in how classroom teachers in the traditional practicum sites and the PDS practicum site respond in their ratings of the following items:
- a. Overall satisfaction with counseling practicum experience
 - b. Fulfillment of a classroom need by counseling practicum program
 - c. Perception of classroom student enjoyment of counseling practicum experience
 - d. Reported improvement in student behavior after involvement with counseling practicum student

- e. Amount of classroom teacher interaction with counseling practicum student
- f. Amount of classroom teacher interaction with counseling practicum supervisor
- g. Amount of communication between classroom teacher, counseling practicum student, and counseling practicum supervisor
- h. Willingness to have counseling practicum students serve classroom students in the future

Hypotheses

1. The hypothesis regarding expected outcomes to the first research question is that there will be no significant differences between the traditional counseling practicum and PDS counseling practicum in terms of achievement of the counseling practicum course objectives.

2. The hypothesis regarding expected outcomes to the second research question is that there will be significant differences between the traditional counseling practicum and PDS counseling practicum in terms of student perception of their achievement of goals beyond the course objectives. Specifically, it is expected that the PDS practicum students will have more positive ratings of their practicum placement.

3. The hypothesis regarding expected outcomes to the third research question is that there will be significant differences between the classroom teachers' perceptions in the PDS site compared to teachers from other practicum sites. Specifically, it is expected that classroom teachers from the PDS site will have more positive ratings of the practicum experience.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Methodology

Subjects

The sample consisted of 15 graduate students enrolled in counseling practicum for that semester, six students who were assigned to the PDS site and nine students who participated in the traditional practicum experience. Only those students whose practicum was at an elementary or middle school site were surveyed.

In addition, the sample consisted of 25 classroom teachers, 10 from the PDS site and 15 from other elementary and middle school practicum sites. All the teachers had children from their classroom who were seen for one-on-one counseling by the practicum student. All student and teacher participation was voluntary and informed consent was obtained.

Instrumentation

Three surveys were developed for the study. The first student survey (Student Survey #1) was based on the course objectives in the Master Course Outline for Counseling Practicum (SUNY Oswego, 1999). These objectives include using interchangeable responses, demonstrating physical attending skills, accurately identifying client concerns, and recognizing indicators of alcohol abuse. The students were asked to rate their acquisition of the 16 course objectives on a Likert scale.

The second student survey (Student Survey #2) contained ten items that were developed to measure variables such as the student's overall opinion of their practicum experience and the amount of interaction with classroom teachers and other school personnel. Examples of items from the second student survey include "How would you rate the quality of your practicum experience?" and "How often did you interact with

your clients' teachers(s)?" The questions were arranged on a four-point Likert scale.

There was also a section for additional comments at the end of the survey.

The third survey (Teacher Survey) was for teachers and contained eight items that served to determine both their perceived benefit of the practicum program, as well as the amount of interaction between classroom teachers, practicum students and supervisors. Examples of questions include "How satisfied were you with the services provided by the counseling practicum students?" and "How often did you interact with the counseling practicum student?" The questions were arranged on a four-point Likert scale. As with the student surveys, there was a section for comments.

Procedure

The researcher met with each group of practicum students to explain the purpose and methods of the study and to request their voluntary participation. Informed consent was obtained. The researcher collected the completed surveys.

In addition to the practicum students, classroom teachers were contacted to provide information. The supervisors of the practicum students in each building were asked to distribute the informed consent letter and the survey to the classroom teachers. The completed consents and surveys were mailed to the researcher.

Limitations

The size of the samples of practicum students ($n=15$) and teachers ($n=25$) was small which limits the power of the statistical analyses. In addition, while every effort was made to create student and teacher surveys with good face validity, the surveys were researcher developed and were not pilot-tested, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Also, the fact that the researcher is employed at the PDS practicum site needs

to be considered. Because collaboration between practicum students and school staff is a variable being considered by this research, it is possible that prior knowledge of the variables may have resulted in a change in behavior on the part of the researcher.

Because of lack of non-random assignment of practicum students to practicum sites, preexisting differences between students was not controlled by this study. Additionally, the impact of the site supervisor on the research outcomes was not controlled by the design. Both of these design limitations threaten the internal validity of the design.

Results

The first hypothesis of this study was that there would be no significant differences between the traditional counseling practicum and PDS counseling practicum in terms of achievement of the counseling practicum course objectives. There were differences between groups and, consequently, this hypothesis was not supported by the data. Student responses on each survey item were combined and a mean score was calculated. The survey mean was used as an estimate of overall student achievement of the course objectives.

Table 1 contains the means and standard deviations of the Student Survey #1. The difference between the two means was statistically significant ($t = 2.73$, $p = 0.02$).

Table 1.

Means and Standard Deviations of Student Survey #1

Practicum Sites	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
PDS Site	4.56	.003	6
Traditional	4.11	.015	9

The second hypothesis of this study was that there would be significant differences between the traditional counseling practicum and PDS counseling practicum in terms of student perception of their achievement of goals beyond the counseling practicum course objectives. The difference between the two means was statistically significant. Thus, the second hypothesis of this project was supported by the data. This hypothesis was tested with survey variables such as the student's overall opinion of

his/her practicum experience and the amount of interaction with classroom teachers and other school personnel. Once again, student responses were combined and the mean score for the entire survey was calculated. The survey mean was used as an estimate of the students' overall rating of the practicum experience and the amount of collaboration and consultation that took place in the setting.

Table 2 contains the means and standard deviations of Student Survey #2. The mean responses for Student Survey #2, for the PDS and traditional counseling practicum sites, were 3.5 and 3.0 ($t = 2.61$, $p = 0.01$).

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations of Student Survey #2

Practicum Sites	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
PDS Site	3.5	.001	6
Traditional	3.0	.003	9

The final hypothesis of this study was that there would be significant differences between the classroom teachers' perceptions in the PDS site compared to teachers from other practicum sites. Specifically, that the teachers at the PDS site would rate the practicum program more favorably than teachers from other settings. This hypothesis was not supported by the data.

Table 3 contains the means and standard deviations of the Teacher Surveys. Twenty-five teacher surveys were returned, consisting of 10 surveys from the PDS site and 15 surveys from other elementary or middle school sites. The teacher survey

measured the teachers' perceptions of the benefit of the practicum program, as well as the amount of interaction between classroom teachers, practicum staff and supervisors. Teacher responses were combined and a mean score for the entire survey was calculated. The survey mean was used as an estimate of the teachers' overall rating of the practicum experience.

The mean responses for the Teacher Survey, for the PDS and traditional counseling practicum sites, were 2.48 and 2.92 ($t = 1.71$, $p = 0.96$) respectively.

Table 3.

Means and Standard Deviations of Teacher Survey

Practicum Sites	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
PDS Site	2.48	.011	10
Traditional	2.92	.267	15

In addition to the quantitative data analysis, the teacher comments were examined as qualitative information. Comments were organized into categories depending on the theme of the comment. For example, teacher comments such as "There needs to be more communication" and "I would have liked to know a little bit about what kinds of activities were done with the children" were grouped together under the category "Increase Communication." Also, comments such as "Increase the students' time on site to two days" and "Practicum Student should be involved in school more than one day per week" are categorized under "Increase Time on Site."

Table 4 contains the categories and frequency of teacher comments. Of the ten teachers from the PDS site, all ten provided additional comments. Of the 15 teacher surveys from other sites, 11 contained additional comments.

Table 4.

Frequency of Teacher Comments

Categories	Sites	
	PDS Site	Traditional Site
Increase Communication	10	6
Increase Time on Site	0	5

Discussion and Summary

The results of the outcome comparisons between the practicum at the PDS site and the other sites were statistically significant for two out of the three hypotheses tested. Despite the previously discussed limitations in the design of this study, it is the opinion of the authors that these results have significant implications for the future practice and research of the counseling practicum.

The first hypothesis, in which there would be no significant differences between the sites in student achievement of the course objectives, was not supported. The PDS practicum students rated the extent to which their experience contributed to their acquisition of counseling skills as higher than students at other sites. This difference may be due to several factors. First, the perception of improved skill development may be attributed to the instructional milieu at the PDS site. As reported by Tyson (1997), students in the PDS are able to observe and be taught by practitioners with expertise in education, while being able to engage in discussions with teachers, administrators and faculty. The structure of the PDS site, which allowed graduate students opportunities to consult with both college and school support staff, before, immediately after and, sometimes as issues arose, may have been a factor in the development of this perception. In addition, on-site collaboration between practicum students, the college practicum instructor who is a certified school counselor, and the primary researcher who is an experienced school psychologist, may have contributed to the students' overall skill development.

The second hypothesis of this study was that there would be significant differences between the graduate students at the PDS and the traditional counseling

practicum sites in terms of their overall satisfaction with the practicum setting, familiarity with the site, and perception of student-university faculty-school personnel collaboration. This hypothesis was supported by the data.

The higher means on Student Survey #2 from the PDS site suggest that students felt more positively about their experience than students at other sites. Also, the students reported more collaboration and consultation. Given that the college practicum instructor was on-site all day, the practicum students had consistent support and consultation services available to them. For instance, those difficult issues that practicum students often face (e.g. challenging client, resistant teachers) could be addressed as they occurred, which was not the case with issues that arose in other groups. In cases where students at the traditional practicum sites could not speak with their site supervisor to discuss a concern, they often must wait for days until they meet with their college instructor.

The implication of the more positive student ratings from the PDS site seems to be that the PDS practicum satisfies a student need that may be desirable to meet for students in all practicum experiences. The PDS structure allowed practicum students to communicate and collaborate frequently with college faculty and school faculty and staff. According to Bernard & Goodyear (1998), these opportunities to receive a high degree of support and ongoing feedback from university staff and supervisors are important for preservice counselors.

The third and final hypothesis of this study was that there would be significant differences between the classroom teachers' perceptions in the PDS site compared to teachers from other practicum sites. Specifically, that teachers from the PDS site would rate the practicum more favorably than teachers in other settings. This hypothesis was

unsupported by the data. Supplemental qualitative information from the Teacher Surveys may illuminate these findings further.

Supplemental Qualitative Information – Teacher Surveys

While not specifically addressed by research hypotheses in this study, teacher comments provided some potentially valuable information regarding communication (or lack thereof) between the counseling practicum students and the classroom teachers.

All of the classroom teachers at the PDS site did not feel that they had sufficient interaction with the practicum students. In fact, of the ten teacher comments, all ten indicated a concern regarding communication. The comments from teachers at the other sites, while certainly not with the singular focus of the PDS teachers, also indicated that communication was an area of concern. Of the 13 teacher comments, five referred specifically to this issue. For example, one teacher wrote that she didn't know the practicum student's name. In light of this information, it seems that opportunities to consult with classroom teachers should be built into the student's experience.

Another theme seen in the comments from teachers in traditional settings was the desire to have counseling practicum students spend more time at the site. Five of the 13 teacher comments addressed this issue. For example, one teacher wrote, "Practicum students should be involved with the school more than just one day a week." Comments like this may suggest a lack of knowledge on the part of teachers regarding the role, experience and expectations of the practicum. Perhaps the college faculty supervisors need to provide more specific information to alleviate this concern.

However, the comments regarding spending more time on site may also be indicative of an increased need for school counseling services, especially at the

elementary and middle school level. The value of the practicum student's contribution to children in one day per week may highlight the need for full time counseling services within the schools.

Summary

Within every counselor education program, the counseling practicum course helps lay the foundation on which pre-service counselors and school psychologists build their counseling skills. Traditionally, these skills have been taught and developed in two separate settings: the on-site setting where the counseling is conducted, and the college setting where the supervision is provided. The interaction between the two sites is limited and often the learning experiences are discrete.

The new training model provides for a continuum of learning experiences, all under one roof. The practicum students at the PDS site had significantly higher ratings of their overall skill development, satisfaction with their practicum setting and communication between other students, their college supervisor, and school personnel. However, these differences were not seen from the classroom teachers' perspective. The need for improved communication between the practicum students and the classroom teachers was an expressed need.

After only its first semester of implementation, the new training model used at the PDS site seems to offer many promising practices for training counseling practicum students. The model is predicated on the belief that collaboration between school personnel and university faculty is critical (Abdall-Haaq, 1989). While the ultimate goal of a counseling practicum is the development of sound counseling skills, these skills do not develop in a vacuum. In the case of practicum students, consistent communication,

collaboration and support with college faculty, practicum supervisors, school support staff and classroom teachers are integral and critical to their overall personal and skill development. With continued development and ongoing evaluation the new training model may realize its full potential as a place where a students' counseling skills, collaboration and human relations skills can develop together.

References

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1989). *The nature of professional development schools*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 548)
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) (2001). *The 2001 CACREP Standards*. Alexandria, VA: CACREP.
- Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- State University of New York at Oswego. (1999, February). *CPS 511 Course Outline*. Oswego, NY: Author
- Tyson, V.V. (1997). The faces of professional development schools [7 paragraphs]. *Alliance Access*. [On-line].
Available: <http://ra.terc.edu/allianceaccess/Vol12-No3/pds.html>